## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5 to 7 and 17 remain for consideration in this application. Claims 2 to 4 and 10 to 13 have been cancelled; and Claims 8,9, and 14 to 16 have been withdrawn. Claims 5 to 7 and 17 have been allowed.

Claim 1 continues to be the only claim currently under rejection in this application. This claim has been amended with this response, in order to clarify the terminology of the claim. Claim 1, in the final Office Action, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by each of the United States patents to Sheldon No. 6,108,914 or Kitz No. 5,979,064. The Examiner has stated that Sheldon teaches a line end termination aperture (96 and 98) on the top surface of the circular flange of the head. The Examiner has also stated that Kitz has a line end termination aperture (nos. 96 and 98) on the top surface of the flange of Kitz.

In both Sheldon and Kitz, similar structure is employed to retain a length of line, the ends of which extend outwardly from the head on opposite sides, in a serpentine path on the head, by means of retainer wedges which are located at approximately the midpoint of the line. The two opposite ends of the line extend radially outwardly from the flange. The retainers, such as the retainers 96 and 98 of Sheldon and also the retainers 96 and 98 f Kitz simply act as wedges in the form of a part of a serpentine

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

line guide path which cooperates with other wedges in that line guide path to impede the movement of line outwardly from the opposing edges of the head or flange and to hold it in place during There is no termination aperture, however, for receiving one of the ends of the line. In the line of each of these patents, the wedges hold the line at a point between the two ends, typically at the midpoint of the cut length of line.

Independent Claim 1, the only claim under rejection in this application, has been amended to recite that the top loading fixed length line trimmer head for a string trimmer machine uses line segments of a predetermined length having first and second ends. Among other elements, Claim 1 now recites at least one line termination aperture for an end of a line on the top surface of the circular flange. Neither Sheldon nor Kitz have an aperture which is designed to receive an end of a line. The term "termination" which is used in Claim 1 is defined in Webster's Third New International Dictionery, Copyright 1961, as "end in time or existence", or "the act of terminating; act of setting bounds or bringing to an end or concluding". The synonym for this word is also shown as the word "end". In this context, the wedges for engaging line at some point intermediate its two ends are not line end terminating apertures. Claim 1 specifically recites at least one termination aperture for an end of a line on the top surface of

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

The basis for the rejection of a claim for a lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is clearly set forth in MPEP §2131 as specifically set forth in applicant's response of February 25, 2005. For that reason, this section of the MPEP is not re-quoted here.

It is important to note, however, that MPEP §2131 requires the identical invention to be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim, and that the elements must be arranged as required by Applicant once again respectfully traverses rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 1 as anticipated by Sheldon or Kitz. Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references include every element of Claim 1 in as complete detail as Claim 1 and arranged as required by the claim.

Neither of these references include at least one termination aperture for an end of a line. Wedges for intermediate portions of a length of line are present in both of these patents. however, is shown or suggested in either patent for ending or terminating one end of the line at some point on either of the heads of Sheldon or Kitz. The line in both of these patents passes entirely through the heads, with one end on one side and one

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

on the other. Only an intermediate portion of the line is wedged in the head in either of these patents. There is nothing in the form of a line end termination aperture, or in the form of a termination aperture for the end of a line in either of these patents.

Since there is no termination aperture for an end of a line in either Sheldon or Kitz, there is no support for the anticipatory rejection of independent Claim 1. Sine the only rejection of Claim 1 is one of anticipation under 135 U.S.C. §102(e), applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, and contrary to the Examiner's position, the rejection of Claim 1 clearly unsupported, as detailed above. As a result, the rejection of is traversed as improper and failing to meet requirements of MPEP §2131. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1; and respectfully requests allowance of Claim 1, along with previously allowed Claims 5 to 7 and 17. A formal Notice of Allowance of all of the claims now appearing in this application is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner does not consider this response in condition for allowance, the courtesy of a telephone interview with applicant's undersigned attorney is respectfully requested.

Respective

LaValle D. Ptak

Registration No. 19,877 LAW OFFICES OF LAVALLE D.

28435 N. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Cave Creek, AZ 85331

Telephone: (480) 419-9019

Date: 44/05

Best Available Copy